DS-252

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Guthrie/DebruyckerWater Project

Proposed Implementation Date: Fall/winter 2007

Proponent: Nels Debruycker / A.B. Guthrie III P.O. Box 541 Choteau, MT 59422

Type and Purpose of Action: To implement a new water development project on the below described tract of land. The primary objective is to enhance forage production, and to implement a new stock water source. The assessment evaluated two projects. The first was installation of a stock water tank and 200' of 1 inch pipeline. The water source will be from existing water well. The second assessment was a new irrigation headgate and 1200' of new ditch. This water source is surplus water from the Eldarado Ditch. A detailed map showing the locations for the project lay out is included within this assessment.

Location: T25N, R5W, Sec 16
Common School Grant

County: Teton

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	DNRC, Surface owner Guthrie/Dubruycker, Surface Lessee
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	None
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	Deny the request

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	[Y/N]	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
		N = Not Present or No Impact will occur. Y = Impacts may occur (explain below)
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactable or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N]	This proposal lies within a large fluvial plain. The soils are quite shallow. The soils very between silt and sandy loam textures. The pipeline to serve the stock tank will be plowed in. Reclamation of the line is not initially required but will be evaluated after completion. The proposed pipeline is anticipated to have limited

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	disturbance, and usually will naturally vegetate within the first year. Productive soils and gentle topography influence the rate of natural revegetation. Although the soils are thin, the project has good productive loams within an overflow range site. The primary plant composition is dominated by bluegrass and Western Wheatgrass. The headgate and ditch do not require reclamation. The objective is to flood the north east portion of the tract to boost grass production. Do not anticipate the species to change in the near term, only grass production. Thus, AUM rating should not have a significant change. However, over the long term, the plant composition may change and thus influence the stocking rate.
5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] Both ground water and surface water will be utilized by this proposal. The well will draw from a large shallow aquifer. Tank volume will be 200 gallons. The head-gate and ditch will utilize excess irrigation water from the Eldarado Ditch. Negative impacts are not anticipated as a result of this project.
6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I air shed)? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There will be no impact to the air shed as a result of this proposal.
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] The vegetative community has the most impact from this type of proposal. The disturbance from the pipeline installation will be minimal due to the productive soil types, and gentle topography. This project requires backfilling the soil and sod profile after completion. The new water source will attract greater livestock numbers to the area, thus changing the dynamics of the vegetative community. This can be a positive response or a negative response depending on management.
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There will not be any adverse impact to fish, wildlife, or birds resulting from this proposal.
9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] Prime Grizzly Bear Habitat.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are	[N] During the field inspection there were no

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	historic sites found. The lease records also indicated no cultural sites present within the proposed area.
11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There are no prominent topographic features within the proposed area.
12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, and AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] Agriculture is basically the sole industry in the area. There are no anticipated cumulative impacts to other activities in the area resulting from this proposal.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of other private, state or federal current actions w/n the analysis area, or from future proposed state actions that are under MEPA review (scoping) or permitting review by any state agency w/n the analysis area?	[N] None

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] This project will not add to the health and safety of the area.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[Y] This project could increase the stocking rate for the producer due to an increase in forage base resulting in increased water distribution.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] This project will be completed by the proponent.
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVE-NUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] Tax revenue will not be affected as a result of this proposal.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There will not be substantial traffic added to the area as a result of this project.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS,	[N] None

	BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	
20.	ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There are no wilderness areas accessed through this tract.
21.	DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] None
22.	SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N] None
23.	CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N] None
24.	OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES: Is there a potential for other future uses for easement area other than for current management? Is future use hypothetical? What is the estimated return to the trust? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] No cumulative impacts are likely to occur as a result of this proposed action.

EA Checklist Prepared By: STEVE DOBSON (Name) LUS (Title) Date: 12-4-07

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Approve the improvement request for installing a livestock water tank, associated pipeline, head gate and new ditch.
26. SIGN4IFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	Short-term and small-scale impacts to the native rangeland under and around the pipeline route is expected. All disturbed areas will be recontoured and reclaimed according to the specifications outlined in this EA. No Archaeological sites are present within the project area. The livestock stock water project will benefit pasture distribution and improve utilization. Overall, no negative environmental impacts are expected.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis: [ ] EIS [ ] More Detailed EA [X] No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: Erik Eneboe (Name) Conrad Unit Manager - CLO (Title)

December 4, 2007

Signature Date